REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1 and 21. Claims 13, 14, 26, and 27 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 15-25, and 28 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 9-12, 15, 18-21, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Karlsson, et al. (US 2005/0221807 A1). The Applicants have amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Karlsson. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicants' claimed invention reduces bandwidth utilization when a client requests user information from an information server. When a client first requests user information, the server sends a notification including the requested information. Upon receiving a subsequent request, the server determines whether the requested information has changed since the first request, and sends a subsequent notification that includes only the changes in the user information. If the user information has not changed, the server sends a subsequent notification that indicates the user information has not changed.

Karlsson discloses a method of obtaining presence information, but does not specifically state that the server provides only changes in response to subsequent requests. The Examiner contends, however, that Karlsson still shows the claimed invention because the user in Karlsson can simply request different information in subsequent requests. The Applicants' amendments to claims 1 and 21 clarify that the same information is requested in each request, the server determines whether there are any changes since the previous request, and the server sends only the changes or sends a notification indicating there are no changes. Basis for the amendments is

found in the originally filed PCT specification on page 20, line 30 through page 21, line 18.

These features are not taught or suggested by Karlsson. Therefore the allowance of amended independent claims 1 and 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 9-12, 15, 18-20, and 28 depend from amended base claims 1 or 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, the allowance of claims 2, 3, 9-12, 15, 18-20, and 28 is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 4-5, 7, 8, 16-17, 22, and 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson, et al. (US 2005/0221807) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA). The Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 21 also distinguish the invention from the combination of Karlsson and APA.

Claims 4-5, 7, 8, 16-17, 22, and 24-25 depend from amended base claims 1 or 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, the allowance of claims 4-5, 7, 8, 16-17, 22, and 24-25 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 14, 23, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karlsson, et al. (US 2005/0221807) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of Bells, et al. (US 2004/0116137). Claims 14 and 27 have been canceled. The Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 21 also distinguish the invention from the combination of Karlsson, APA, and Bells.

The Examiner cites Bells, particularly paragraphs 0036 and 0038 for showing a presence updating procedure in which the server sends only changes to the client or only an indication that nothing has changed. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, as indicated in paragraph 0037, the server is Bells is operating in "push" mode in which the server sends changes to the client whenever changes in the user

information occur. The Applicants' claimed invention, on the other hand, recites a procedure in which the server operates in a "pull" mode in which the client requests the information, and the server then determines if there are any changes and sends only the changes or an indication that there are no changes.

Second, paragraph 0038 of Bells specifically states that the server's periodical notifications include the user states. Thus, Bells expressly teaches sending information that has not changed.

Claims 6 and 23 depend from amended claims 1 or 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, the allowance of claims 6 and 23 is respectfully requested.

4.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-12, 15-25, and 28.

The Applicants request a telephone interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven W. Smith, Reg. No. 36,684/

Date: February 2, 2011

Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com